REMARKS

Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form to secure its allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated. Claim 1 has been combined with claims 2, 3 and 5 and those claims have been cancelled. The nature of the opening in the cage is clarified as a through opening. The Taylor reference uses a lower lip 62 that has blind bores that must be precision drilled into it to properly fit up the pins 64 that a machined to extend from disc 18. Claim 1 uses a through opening that makes securing the stationary orifice member far easier and removes the need for precision machining. While the Examiner has recognized that a specific embodiment of such a securing method using a Woodruff key is patentable in claim 6, claim 1 is simply a somewhat broader recitation of the concept where a Woodruff key is but a specific example. The mode of attachment of the stationary disc in claim 1 is not anticipated by Taylor because the Taylor assembly method requires precision machining and the valve of claim 1 using the through opening avoids that problem.

Claims 13-20 have been rejected as obvious using a combination of Taylor combined with Ko. Applicant's response will focus on independent claim 13 although the argument is applicable to all the claims dependent on claim 13 and rejected by this combination. First, it must be recognized that the pins 23 (and their receiving bore in the stem 22) that are driven by stem 22 to drive the disc 20 in Taylor are not at the periphery of disc 20. Rather, the pins 23 are on top. Beyond that the Examiner has misinterpreted the drawings of Ko in making the combination. The stem assembly in Ko is 50. It has a center driving tab 505 shown in Figure 1. That tab passes through slot 521 in plate 52 and then goes into slot 531 of the movable disc 53. Item 52 is described as a "restraint disc" which due to the fact that this application was translated from Chinese can be interpreted from the application to be a spacer. The downwardly oriented tabs 522 on the spacer 52 simply help align its slot 521 with the slot 531 on the rotating disc 53 so that the centrally oriented driving tab 505 can pass on assembly directly though both slots 521 and 531. Note all these parts are recited to be plastic and the application of Ko is to a water faucet. To the extent that the patent drawings are anywhere close to scale it certainly looks as though the drive tab 505 is way beefier than the locating tabs 522 on the spacer 52. In short, the purported combination is not suggested as Ko drives with an elongated tab on

center. Taylor drives with a series of pins that are off center. Taylor is directed at an industrial product while Ko is a consumer oriented water faucet with the major components being plastic. The references are not compatible in their driving mechanism types, or heir locations. Beyond that claim 13 states that the prime driving is done in peripheral recess. Even if tabs 522 of Ko do some driving, which is not the case; it is clear that the prime driver is center tab 505.

As to claims 10-12 see the arguments with regard to claim 1 and consider the arguments above recognizing that the concept of the prime mover is not in these claims that depend from claim 1.

December 29, 2005

Richard T. Redano

Richard T. Redano
Reg. No. 32,292
Duane Morris LLP
3200 Southwest Freeway
Suite 3150
Houston, TX 77027
Tel.: 713.402.3900
Fax: 713. 402.3901

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that a copy of this document along with any referred to as attached or enclosed is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 29, 2005.

Tracie Thigpen

HOU\47270.1